

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
DECEMBER 12, 1980, IN LISNER HALL  
ROOM 603

1 The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m. by Provost Bright.

Present: Provost Bright, Registrar Gebhartsbauer, Parliamentarian Cheh, Birnbaum, Chitwood, Divita, Frey, Griffith, Heddesheimer, Hill, Kelly, Kirsch, Liebowitz, Linkowski, Loeser, Mazzeo, Morgan, Packer, Park, Pierpont, Robinson, Schiff, H. Solomon, Toridis, Wallace, and Ziolkowski

Absent: President Elliott, Barron, Chandler, Fox, Gallagher, Hawkins, Linton, Reiss, Sapin, L. Solomon, Steiner, and Walker

2 The minutes of the regular meeting of November 14, 1980, were approved as distributed.

3 (a) On behalf of the University and Urban Affairs Committee, Professor Toridis moved the adoption of Resolution 80/15, "A Resolution Supporting Current Plans by the University for the Development of the Red Lion Row," and the motion was seconded. Professor Toridis explained that the committee had held several hearings to which President Elliott and Vice President Diehl and his staff supplied information to aid in assessing the various benefits of this development for the University and urban community. At the same time, he said, the committee conducted a survey of faculty opinions on the desirability and types of retail stores in this area, and as a result of this survey, the committee ascertained that there had been sufficient dialogue between the University administration and various segments of the University community as pertaining to the use of retail space, as well as to the preservation of historic buildings, to merit faculty support of the proposed Red Lion Row development, and he urged the adoption of this resolution.

Professor Hill pointed out that the Executive Committee routinely put this resolution on the agenda, but that yesterday he had received a call from a member of the Physical Facilities Committee who voiced the opinion that this matter should have been referred to the Physical Facilities Committee as well; otherwise, some doubt would be cast on the charge to the committee if it didn't have a voice in this resolution. Professor Toridis responded that his committee certainly didn't want to create a jurisdictional conflict and he pointed out that his committee addressed itself only to the impact of this development as far as the urban community was concerned--it did not address itself to the questions of architectural design, the layout, or the physical structure, which matters properly belonged under the jurisdiction of the Physical Facilities Committee. Professor Chitwood said although he personally had not seen the plan for this development, it was brought to his attention that some student groups were

concerned about the physical design of the back of the development which would be an unattractive block-long, windowless, 4-story wall of concrete as described to him. He said he was in concurrence with the other dimensions of this resolution pertaining to the preservation of the historical and commercial aspects, but he would recommend tabling the resolution until the Senate had an opportunity to actually view the plan itself especially with regard to the problem he described relating to the physical design. Professor Morgan said he agreed with the comments just made and he moved to refer the resolution to the Physical Facilities Committee to be reported back to the Faculty Senate no later than the February meeting. The motion was seconded. Professor Griffith said that if the motion to refer was approved, he would request that a presentation of the plan be made to the Senate at the time the resolution was reported back in February. Professor Morgan and the seconder agreed to add Professor Griffith's request to the motion. The question was called and the motion to refer Resolution 80/15 to the Physical Facilities Committee to be reported back no later than February at which time a presentation would be made to the Senate on the Red Lion Row development was adopted unanimously. (Resolution 80/15 with Interim Report attached.)

- 3 (b) On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Hill moved the adoption of Resolution 80/16, "A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Organization Plan to Conform to a Constitutional Change in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences," and the motion was seconded. Professor Hill explained that this resolution was proposed as merely a "housekeeping" amendment to eliminate reference to the "Executive Faculty" of the Medical School, which no longer existed, appearing in the language of the Faculty Organization Plan, Article III, Section 3(3). The question was called and Resolution 80/16 was adopted unanimously. (Resolution 80/16 attached.)

(c) Before moving the adoption of Resolution 80/17, "A Resolution to Amend the Student Grievance Procedures of the 'Guide to Student Rights and Responsibilities,'" Professor Chitwood, Co-Chairperson of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, proposed the following amendment to Section F, Paragraph 1, (p. 3 of Dr. Phelps' letter dated October 17, 1980):

(underlining indicating new matter)

Individuals who feel they have been discriminated against by having been denied the rights and privileges of membership or participation in registered student organizations may also charge the registered student organization under these procedures.

Professor Chitwood said that this additional amendment had been approved by Dr. Phelps. He explained that Resolution 80/17 was an attempt to resolve two problems found in the student grievance procedures in the past. The first problem dealt with the absence of existing grievance procedures to allow individuals and student groups to charge student groups, acting under the sanction of the University, with discrimination. The second problem, he said, was finding students to staff the panel at the graduate level and during the summer to rule on discrimination complaints. The changes proposed in this resolution, Professor Chitwood said, would attempt to take care of both of these problems, and he moved the adoption of Resolution 80/17,

as amended. The motion was seconded.

Professor Park moved the following amendment to Section F, Paragraph 2 (p. 3 of Dr. Phelps' letter dated October 17, 1980):

(underlining indicating new matter)

Grievance Review Committees for the student organizational matters shall consist of two faculty members, one administrator, and two students.

Professor Park said that he thought there should be two faculty members instead of one so that the committee would be an odd-numbered rather than even-numbered one in the interest of efficiency. A second point would be that he thought the faculty had a long history of being very sympathetic to students' interests and students' rights, and where there was the potential for emotional confrontations in issues such as these, the faculty, particularly in this kind of area, was in a better position to bring distance and a sense of proportion to these kinds of disputes than were students. The motion was seconded. Professor Chitwood and Dr. Phelps responded that they had no objections to Professor Park's amendment. The question was called and the amendment was adopted. A discussion followed by Professors Griffith, Chitwood, Hill and Dr. Phelps. The question was called and Resolution 80/17, as amended, was adopted unanimously. (Resolution 80/17 attached.)

- 3 (d) Professor Chitwood, on behalf of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, moved the adoption of Resolution 80/18, "A Resolution to Amend Further the Student Grievance Procedures of the 'Guide to Student Rights and Responsibilities,'" and the motion was seconded. He said that the committee thought that Section F. of the Students Grievance Procedures should be placed under Section I.B. which deals with types of discrimination complaints, and, secondly, that Section G. be amended to include the Student Senate as a body to review any proposed revisions in the Procedures in addition to the Faculty Senate and the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students. He said that Mr. Doug Atwell, representative of the Student Association, was present to answer any questions the members might have. Professor Hill said that the Executive Committee was not certain what was meant by "Student Association" in the second paragraph of the resolving clause, but if it meant "Student Senate," he asked Professor Chitwood if he would accept substituting the word "Senate" for "Association." Professor Chitwood responded affirmatively and the seconder accepted the substitution also. The question was called, and Resolution 80/18, as amended was adopted unanimously. (Resolution 80/18 attached.)

- 3 (e) On behalf of the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies, Professor Robinson moved the adoption of Resolution 80/19, "A Resolution on Tuition Benefits," and the motion was seconded. Dean Birnbaum said that the Medical School would have great difficulty if this policy was adopted because (1) there were different fringe benefits for faculty and non-academic staff, and (2) there were a limited number of students in their program and tuition was a major source of income for the Medical School, and the loss would have to be charged to the other matriculating students.

Professor Morgan responded that Dean Birnbaum's point was a correct one, but he wished to have it noted that in the case of the other schools, the cost was absorbed, not by the students in tuition, but by the faculty through additional effort. Professor Robinson said she would accept amending the resolution to include the language "with the exception of the Medical School," and the seconder agreed. Dean Kelly asked if a student took only two years of undergraduate work here, would that student be allowed some graduate tuition credit since the resolution assumes four years of undergraduate work. Professor Robinson said that the committee's interpretation was that there was "X" number of dollars in tuition benefits in effect, and that those could now be applied to graduate and professional study. Professor Schiff proposed adding the word "maximum" at the end of the first line so that the same would read, "That in the event the said faculty do not utilize the maximum undergraduate tuition benefit. . . ." Professor Robinson accepted Professor Schiff's recommendation. Professor Wallace suggested adding the words "the remaining" after the word "children" so that the same would read, "children, the remaining benefits may be applied towards tuition. . . ." A discussion followed by Professors Ziolkowski, Robinson, Hill, Cheh, Morgan, Griffith, and Provost Bright.

Professor Park said that it was important to make clear that these benefits are not income substitutes, but that they accrue to the child rather than to the faculty member, so as not to offend the IRS. Secondly, he thought the benefit should include staff as well as faculty, and, lastly, he thought that the children who were eligible must be properly admitted to such programs as this was not a scheme of automatic admission. Professor Park said he was not an official representative of the Law School, but he did not think the Law School bore the peculiar cost burden of the Medical School and he thought the Law School would want to participate in this policy. He then suggested the following amendment:

That in the event that any legally dependent child of university staff does not utilize the maximum undergraduate tuition benefits, those remaining benefits may be applied to University graduate and professional programs by such child properly admitted to such program.

Provost Bright said that, since tuition changes from year to year, he would assume then that if a student had failed to take advantage of two years of tuition, that tuition would be evaluated at the current level. Professor Park replied that he would agree--that it would be evaluated as tuition and not as dollars. Professor Kirsch suggested that the language "excluding the Medical School" be added. In the case where there were three children, for instance, Dean Liebowitz asked if two of them utilized the undergraduate tuition and the third did not, whether any one of the three children could use the graduate tuition benefits. Professor Robinson replied that it was an individual benefit--one child could not use a sibling's benefits. Further discussion followed by Professors Park, Hill, Morgan, Schiff, Dean Solomon, Dean Liebowitz, and Provost Bright.

Professor Divita thought that the motion should not be acted upon today, but returned to the committee for more precise language which the Senate would find more acceptable. Professor Pierpont moved that the resolution be returned to the committee for clarification and brought back at the next Senate meeting, and the



motion was seconded. Professor Morgan supported Professor Pierpont's motion but wanted to make it clear that the Senate generally approved the resolution, and he requested that this resolution be reported back on a specific date. Professor Robinson said that she would like to defer the matter until the February Senate meeting in order to give her committee time to review the recommendations. The question was called and the motion to return the resolution to the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies to be reported back at the February Senate meeting was adopted. (Resolution 80/19 attached.)

- 4 Under Introduction of Resolutions, Professor Mazzeo reported that the Library Committee had met on December 4 and approved the wording for a resolution regarding the appreciation of the University to the Gelman family, and the committee wished to submit that resolution for consideration at the January 16th Senate meeting.

- 5 (a) Professor Hill moved the following nominations: Lewis D. Solomon, Professor of Law, to the Executive Committee to replace Professor Robert E. Park who will be on spring sabbatical; Martha Burns, Associate Professor of Education, to be a member of the Committee on the Judicial System (replacing Professor Donald Linkowski who will be on spring sabbatical); Mary Cheh, Associate Professor of Law, to serve as Acting Chair of the Committee on the Judicial System (replacing Professor Linkowski as Chairman of this committee, of which she is already a member); Ellen Servetnick, GWUSA Vice President for Student Affairs, to be a member of the Senate Committee on Public Ceremonies; Andrew Poat, GWUSA Committee person, to be a member of the Senate Committee on Public Ceremonies; Kathy Nathan, GWUSA Vice President for Academic Affairs, to be a member of the Senate Library Committee (on motion from Professor Mazzeo); and Ronald A. Nieberding, GWUSA Deputy Vice President for Academic Affairs, to be a member of the Senate Library Committee (on motion by Professor Mazzeo).

No other nominations were made from the floor and the entire slate was approved.

- (b) Professor Hill advised the Senate that the Executive Committee asked Professor Arthur Kirsch to serve as the Faculty Senate representative on the administrative committee that was planning a University-wide conference on retirement in February, and that Professor Kirsch had agreed to serve.

- (c) Professor Griffith reported that the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee hoped to have its proposed revisions to the Faculty Code on the January agenda pertaining to manner of appointments to non-tenure-track positions, and that members might wish to bring along their copy of the Faculty Code for reference.

- 6 Professor Hill reported under Brief Statements that in reply to Professor Griffith's question to President Elliott at the last Senate meeting as to whether or not the President and the Board of Trustees had acceded to Senate Resolution 80/1, which put a limit of 25% on non-tenure-accruing faculty in each school, he said that the President had authorized him to reply on his behalf that he was in favor in principle of limiting the number of non-tenured faculty, but whether

he would accept that figure or not depended on other factors. Professor Griffith responded that he wished to make the record quite clear--that his question was not whether the President acceded, but whether or not he recommended that resolution to the Board and whether it had been approved. Professor Hill said that the answer was "no."

- 7      Upon motion made and seconded, Provost Bright adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Robert Gebhardtsbauer".

Robert Gebhardtsbauer  
Secretary

A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING CURRENT PLANS BY THE UNIVERSITY  
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RED LION ROW (80/15)

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the Faculty supports the proposed plans by the University  
for the Red Lion Row Development. In particular, it supports  
the preservation of the existing historic structures as  
currently envisioned by the University, and the extensive  
retail space included in the development.

Committee on University and Urban Affairs  
November 24, 1980

Referred December 12, 1980, to Physical Facilities Committee for  
reintroduction at February Senate meeting.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate--1980-1981 Session

Interim Report of the University Urban Affairs Committee

During the initial period of the 1980-81 Session of the Faculty Senate, the Committee on University and Urban Affairs met three times to consider current plans by the University for the development of the campus area. Initially, the Committee met with Vice President & Treasurer Diehl and members of his staff to obtain information on University plans for the development of the Red Lion Row, known also as the 2000 block of "I" Street, N.W.

In the last meeting of the Committee, Mr. Ken Brooks from Vice President Diehl's office made a presentation of the architectural plans and perspective views of the proposed Red Lion building project, focusing on the general layout and types of retail stores to be established within the building. Subsequently, the Committee continued its deliberations and agreed to compile a summary of its findings pertaining to the proposed Red Lion Project, as indicated below:

1. The George Washington University has made public detailed plans for the Red Lion project to be built on Eye Street between 20th and 21st Streets, N.W.
2. The University had previously solicited input from the Faculty, the Student Body, and Neighborhood Groups for consideration during the preparation stage of the plans for the proposed project.
3. The Faculty Senate Committee on University and Urban Affairs conducted a survey of faculty opinion on the desirability and types of retail stores in the campus area which indicated strong support by the faculty towards the establishment of certain types of retail stores in the area.

The following resolution was then introduced and passed unanimously for transmittal to the Faculty Senate:

A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING CURRENT PLANS BY THE UNIVERSITY FOR  
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RED LION ROW

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON  
UNIVERSITY

That the Faculty supports the proposed plans by the University for the Red Lion Row Development. In particular, it supports the preservation of the existing historic structures as currently envisioned by the University, and the extensive retail space included in the development.



The Committee recommends that the above resolution be placed on the agenda of the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, for possible adoption by the Senate.

Respectfully submitted, .

*Theodore G. Toridis*

Theodore G. Toridis, Chairman

Morgan DeLaney

Howard F. Gillette, Jr.

John C. Lowe

Fran S. Marsh

Honey W. Nashman

William M. Reynolds

Russell B. Stevenson

Louis H. Mayo, ex officio

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN TO CONFORM TO A  
CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE IN THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES (80/16)

WHEREAS, the School of Medicine no longer has an "executive faculty"  
for whom specific voting eligibility need be set forth;  
therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the Faculty Senate petition the President to propose  
to the next Faculty Assembly that the Faculty Organization  
Plan be amended in Article III.3(3) to delete from the present  
text the clause placed in brackets, below, and to insert a  
period after the word "vote."

"(3) Only members of the faculty in full-time service  
shall be eligible to vote. [, except that, in the case of the  
School of Medicine and Health Sciences, all members of the  
Executive Faculty shall be eligible to vote for Senate members.]"

Executive Committee  
November 26, 1980

Adopted December 12, 1980

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES OF THE  
"GUIDE TO STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES" (80/17)

WHEREAS, Section II-F of the Student Grievance Procedures directs:  
"The effectiveness and fairness of these procedures shall be  
reviewed by an appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate  
four years after becoming the official policy of the University  
with any recommended revisions to be brought before the  
Faculty Senate"; and

WHEREAS, the four years will have passed by January of 1981; and

WHEREAS, several difficulties and omissions in the existing procedures  
have been identified during their implementation since 1977; and

WHEREAS, Marianne R. Phelps, Assistant Provost for Affirmative Action,, ,  
has proposed in her letters of October 17 and 24, 1980, several  
changes to correct these deficiencies in the Student Grievance  
Procedures; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- (1) That Dr. Phelps' letters of October 17 and 24, 1980,  
relating to Student Grievance Procedures, be accepted  
in the form of a report to the Faculty Senate; and
- (2) That the Faculty Senate approve the changes in the text  
of the document known as "Student Grievance Procedures"  
which are specified in those two letters. (See  
attachments.)

Joint Committee of Faculty and Students  
November 21, 1980

Adopted, as amended, December 12, 1980

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

October 17, 1980

TO: Dr. Peter Hill  
Chairman of the Executive Committee  
of the Faculty Senate

FROM: *Marianne R. Phelps*  
Dr. Marianne R. Phelps  
Assistant Provost for Affirmative Action

RE: Student Grievance Procedures

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide information for the review of the Student Grievance Procedures which was specified by the Faculty Senate at the time the Senate voted to recommend adoption of the procedures.

Use of the Student Grievance Procedures

Since their adoption the grievance procedures have been invoked on three occasions. Two individuals alleged discrimination on the basis of race; one discrimination on the basis of national origin. Two students alleged their termination from their academic programs was discriminatory. In both instances Grievance Review Committees found the terminations to have been based on academic grounds and consistent with the policies of the schools. The third complaint was made against a department for failing to award the student an assistantship. This complaint was resolved at the stage of mediation.

Four additional students and one student group have contacted me to discuss bringing grievances. Two of these students asked me to mediate the dispute rather than file formal complaints. A third student filed his complaint with the District of Columbia Office of Human Rights which found for the University. The fourth student did not file a formal complaint.



The student group which sought to use the Student Grievance Procedures was Womanspace which alleged the Student Association Finance Committee had discriminated in the amount of funds it recommended for the group. The Student Grievance Procedures do not provide adequately for such a complaint. In addition, GWUSA guidelines specified the Student Court as the body to hear complaints arising from the funding process. John Perkins and I attempted to get representatives of Womanspace and the Finance Committee to agree on a way the complaint could be resolved. Failing in that effort, I requested University Counsel's opinion on which procedures should be offered to Womanspace. He recommended that the University offer the Student Court.

Womanspace then filed a complaint with the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the Department of Education. OCR concluded that Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 requires the University to amend its Student Grievance Procedures to permit individuals and/or groups to bring complaints against students and/or student groups in those situations where they are acting in an official capacity for the University. The University has agreed to make the revision and to supply OCR with an amended document by December 2, 1980.

#### Revisions to the Student Grievance Procedures

Since the Grievance Procedures were adopted, the Senate has recommended four revisions which have been incorporated into the document. Handicap was added to the list of protected classes. Other revisions provided for Department Heads, Deans and Vice Presidents to disqualify themselves because of prior knowledge and directed the Assistant Provost for Affirmative Action to provide copies of the findings of the Grievance Review Committees to both parties.

In considering revision, it is important to take cognizance of the fact that with the exception noted previously the OCR has informed the University that the Student Grievance Procedures are adequate. Substantive changes in the procedures might not be acceptable to the civil rights agency.

The following addition to the Student Grievance Procedures is recommended to comply with OCR's interpretation of the requirements of Title IX:

DELETE: F. The effectiveness and fairness of these procedures shall be reviewed by an appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate four years after becoming the official policy of the University with any recommended revisions to be brought before the Faculty Senate. This review requirement, however, does not preclude revision of these procedures during the four year period.

ADD: F. Individuals and/or registered student organizations who feel they have been discriminated against by chartered student organizations as they act to carry out responsibilities specifically delegated to them by the Board of Trustees or the President may charge the organization under these procedures. Individuals who feel they have been discriminated against by having been denied the rights and privileges of membership/in registered student organizations may also charge the registered student organization under these procedures. University policy permits campus organizations that are social fraternal groups to limit membership on the basis of sex and sectarian groups to limit membership on the basis of religion. <sup>or participation</sup>

A faculty member or administrator having administrative responsibility relating to the group being charged shall be appointed by the Assistant Provost for Affirmative Action to carry out the functions assigned to the department chairman outlined in IIC. Grievance Review Committees for the student organizational matters shall consist of <sup>two</sup> ~~one~~ faculty <sup>members</sup> ~~member~~, one administrator, and two students.

The addition specified by OCR is contained in the first sentence. The second sentence would enable individuals to challenge what they might regard as discrimination in the membership practices of registered groups. By way of background, in 1968 the University adopted a Human Relations Act prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, and creed in campus organizations and specifying procedures for adjudicating complaints. In 1976 the University adopted a policy prohibiting recognition of single sex organizations with the exception of social fraternities and sororities. Age and handicap should be added as protected classes, and in my judgement the Student Grievance procedures should be used to resolve complaints of discrimination in membership practices.

Placed under  
Section I.F.

Providing the same procedures simplifies the process. In addition, it is likely that, in the event of a complaint regarding membership practices, OCR would take the same position as they did in the complaint of Woman-space.

Aside from the revision required by the OCR, I see only a few weaknesses in the Student Grievance Procedures. The first is the composition of the student panel. All three students who have invoked the procedures thus far have been graduate students. Despite efforts of the Student Association Presidents to nominate diverse groups, the student panels have been made up almost solely of undergraduates, predominately freshmen and sophomores. If the graduate and professional schools are to have confidence in the process, it is important that there be students enrolled in graduate and professional schools available to serve on the panels.

Another difficulty with the student panels is in the timing of their appointment. Given the number of appointments the president of GWUSA must make in a short period of time at the end of the Spring semester, it has been difficult to get the student panels appointed by July 1 of each year. This leaves a period of time during which no Grievance Review Committees can be appointed. On the one occasion when a grievance arose during the summer, only four students had been appointed to the panel and none of these students were in Washington for the summer.

One other change in the panels appears warranted. In the light of experience, it is feasible to reduce the size of the faculty and student panels from fifteen to ten.

The following revised section is suggested to address the problems described above:

Section IIE3 Committee members will be selected from among a panel of ten faculty members selected by the Faculty Senate, ten students selected by the George Washington University Student Association, and five administrators selected by the Vice President for Administration. At least five students named to the panel shall be enrolled in programs at the graduate level. Appointments to the panel shall be made for one year from July 1 to June 30. Appointments are renewable. The Assistant Provost for Affirmative Action will select the Committee members for each review and will appoint one of the members to serve as Chairperson. In the event panel members are not available to serve, the Assistant Provost for Af-

firmative Action shall have the authority to appoint committee members to hear a particular grievance. from the appropriate constituency from outside of the panels. Upon the request of the Chairperson, the Assistant Provost for Affirmative Action shall serve as adviser to the Review Committee.

I would be happy to provide whatever assistance I can as the Senate undertakes its review.



THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

October 24, 1980

TO: Members of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students  
FROM: *Marianne R. Phelps*  
Marianne R. Phelps  
Assistant Provost for Affirmative Action

After preliminary talks with Dr. Hill, the Judicial Committee, and the Joint Committee, I am suggesting two further changes to the Student Grievance Procedures:

Add to proposed Section IIE3, 12th line following the word panels: "to hear a particular grievance."

Add new Section G:

The Faculty Senate and the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students shall be consulted before any revisions are made to these procedures.

Under Resolution (80/18) Section G becomes Section F to read as follows:  
The Faculty Senate, the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students and the Student Senate shall be consulted before any revisions are made to these procedures.

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND FURTHER THE STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES  
OF THE "GUIDE TO STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES" (80/18)

WHEREAS, the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students wishes to amend  
further the text and format of the Student Grievance  
Procedures; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- (1) That Section F of the Student Grievance Procedures  
(as and if adopted under Senate Resolution 80/17)  
be placed under Section I.B. which addresses the types  
of discrimination complaints handled under those  
Procedures; and
- (2) That Section G (as and if adopted under Senate  
Resolution 80/17) be amended to add the Student  
~~Association~~<sup>Senate</sup> to the Faculty Senate and the Joint  
Committee as a body that shall be consulted before  
any revisions are made to the Procedures; and
- (3) That if the new Section F is included elsewhere in  
the document, Section G be changed to Section F.

Joint Committee of Faculty and Students  
November 21, 1980

Adopted, as amended, December 12, 1980

A RESOLUTION ON TUITION BENEFITS (80/19)

WHEREAS, full remission of undergraduate tuition at the University is provided for legally-dependent children of full-time members of the faculty; and

WHEREAS, some faculty do not make use of the undergraduate tuition benefit; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That in the event that said faculty do not utilize the undergraduate tuition benefit for their legally-dependent children, these benefits may be applied towards tuition in the University's graduate and professional programs.

Committee on Appointment, Salary and  
Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits)  
November 14, 1980

Returned December 12, 1980, to the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee for clarification and reintroduction at the February Senate meeting.

1941-1942

1943-1944

1945-1946

1947-1948

1949-1950

1951-1952

1953-1954

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate

December 2, 1980

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, December 12, 1980, at 2:10 p.m., in the Faculty Conference Room, Sixth Floor, Lisner Hall.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of the regular meeting of November 14, 1980
3. Resolutions:
  - (a) A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING CURRENT PLANS BY THE UNIVERSITY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RED LION ROW (80/15), Professor Theodore G. Toridis, Chairman, University and Urban Affairs Committee (resolution attached)
  - (b) A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN TO CONFORM TO A CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE IN THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES (80/16), Professor Peter P. Hill, Chairman, Executive Committee (resolution attached)
  - (c) A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES OF THE "GUIDE TO STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES" (80/17), Professor Stephen R. Chitwood, Co-Chairperson, Joint Committee of Faculty and Students (resolution attached)
  - (d) A RESOLUTION TO AMEND FURTHER THE STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES OF THE "GUIDE TO STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES" (80/18), Professor Stephen R. Chitwood, Co-Chairperson, Joint Committee of Faculty and Students (resolution attached)
  - (e) A RESOLUTION ON TUITION BENEFITS (80/19), Professor Lilien E. Robinson, Chairman, Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee (resolution attached)
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. General Business:
  - (a) Nomination for election of Lewis D. Solomon, Professor of Law, to the Executive Committee as replacement for Professor Robert E. Park (sabbatical leave-Spring Semester 1981); nomination for appointment of \_\_\_\_\_ to the Committee on the Judicial System as Acting Chairman as replacement for Professor Donald Linkowski, Chairman (sabbatical leave-Spring Semester 1981)

5. General Business (continued)

(b) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Peter P. Hill,  
Chairman

(c) Interim Reports of Senate Standing Committees

6. Brief Statements

7. Adjournment

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert Gebhardtsbauer".

Robert Gebhardtsbauer  
Secretary